1 2 3 4 5	SPENCER FANE LLP Andrew M. Federhar (No. 006567) Jessica A. Gale (No. 030583) 2425 East Camelback Road, Suite 850 Phoenix, AZ 85016-4251 Telephone: (602) 333-5430 Fax: (602) 333-5431 afederhar@spencerfane.com jgale@spencerfane.com	
6 7	Attorneys for Defendants Humana Insurance Company and Humana Health Plan, Inc.	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
10	SHERRIN ROSE, an individual,	Case No.
11	,	
12	Plaintiff,	(Removal from Yavapai County Superior Court No. 201700336)
13	V.	NOTICE OF REMOVAL
14	HUMANA INSURANCE COMPANY, a Kentucky corporation; HUMANA	
15	HEALTH PLAN, INC., a Kentucky corporation; JOHN DOES I-X and	
16	JAÑE DOES I-X; ABC CORPORATIONS I-X; BLACK AND	
17	WHITE PARTNERSHIPS and/or SOLE PROPRIETORSHIPS I-X,	
18	Defendants.	
19		
20	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b) and 1446(b), Defendants Humana	
21	Insurance Company and Humana Health Plan, Inc. (collectively the "Humana	
22	Defendants") provide notice of their removal of the action entitled Sherrin Rose v.	
23	Humana Insurance Company, et al., Yavapai County Superior Court No. 20170036 (the	
24	"Action"), to the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, Phoenix	
25	Division.	
26	The Humana Defendants are permitted to remove the Action because the Court has	

jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Complaint based upon diversity. Specifically, there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and the Humana Defendants and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. The following facts and analysis support the Humana Defendants' Notice of Removal.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 2, 2017, Plaintiff filed her Complaint, alleging claims of breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, unjust enrichment/quantum meruit, and interference with business expectancies, arising out of a dispute over the Humana Defendants' termination of Plaintiff's Group Producing Agent Contract. The Humana Defendants were served with a copy of the Summons, Complaint and Certificate of Compulsory Arbitration by personal service on its statutory agent on May 22, 2017. This Notice of Removal is being filed within 30 days of service.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Action is removable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction over the Action. Specifically, this Court has diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the Action is between citizens of different states and the matter in controversy exceeds the statutory sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

A. Plaintiff and the Humana Defendants are diverse in citizenship.

Plaintiff is a resident of Yavapai County, Arizona. Complaint ¶ 1. Plaintiff is therefore a citizen of Arizona, the state in which she is domiciled. *Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001) (citing *Lew v. Moss*, 797 F.2d 747, 749 (9th Cir. 1986) (a natural person's state citizenship is determined by the party's state of domicile).

The two Humana Defendants are corporations. Each corporate entity is considered to be a citizen of the state where it is incorporated and of the state where it has its

principal place of business. *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 80 (2010). Humana Insurance Company is a Wisconsin corporation with its principal place of business in DePere, Wisconsin. Exhibit A, Kentucky Corporation Commission Information for Humana Insurance Company, Inc. Humana Health Plan, Inc. is a Kentucky corporation, with its principal place of business in Louisville, Kentucky. Exhibit B, Arizona Corporation Commission Information for Humana Health Plan, Inc. Plaintiff has also asserted claims against several fictitious defendants. "[T]he citizenship of defendants sued under fictitious names shall be disregarded for the purposes of removal." *Dream Team Holdings LLC v. Alarcon*, No. CV-16-01420-PHX-DLR, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140196, *10 (D. Ariz. Oct. 7, 2016) (quoting *Newcombe v. Adolf Coors Co.*, 157 F.3d 686, 690 (9th Cir. 1998)). As such, complete diversity of citizenship exists between Plaintiff and Humana.

B. The jurisdictional amount in controversy is sufficient for removal.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1), "the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs, and is between . . . citizens of different States[.]" The amount in controversy in this Action exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs. In fact, it is "facially apparent" from the Complaint that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. *Abrego Abrego v. Dow Chemical Co.*, 443 F.3d 676, 690 (9th Cir. 2006). Humana denies that it acted improperly, caused Plaintiff any damage or is liable in the Action, but Plaintiff's Complaint affirmatively alleges that Plaintiff is seeking damages in excess of \$163,000. *See* Complaint ¶¶ 30–32.

Plaintiff's Complaint also seeks additional damages for the torts of bad faith (Count Two) and interference with business expectancies (Count Four), punitive damages, and an award of attorneys' fees, all of which are considered for the purposes of calculating the amount in controversy. *See Bradshaw Home Med. Equip., L.L.C. v. Hospice Family*

Care, No. 13-CV-8218-PCT-PGR, 2013 WL 6228657, at *2 (D. Ariz. Dec. 2, 2013); Ansley v. Metro. Life Ins. Co., 215 F.R.D. 575, 577 (D. Ariz. 2003).

It is only when a complaint fails to allege a specific amount of damages that the removing party has to prove by a preponderance of evidence that the amount in controversy meets the diversity jurisdictional amount of \$75,000. *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.* 980 F.2d 564, 567 (9th Cir. 1992). Here, the amount in controversy is "facially apparent" from Plaintiff's Complaint. Therefore, Humana has shown that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, and the case is eligible for removal based on diversity jurisdiction.

C. The requirements of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1446(b)(1) and (b)(2) are met.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), Humana's Notice of Removal is timely filed. Humana was served with a copy of the Summons, Complaint and Certificate of Compulsory Arbitration by personal service on May 22, 2017. *See* Exhibit C. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), a notice of removal must be filed within thirty (30) days after the defendant's receipt of "a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which such action or proceeding is based." Accordingly, Humana's Notice of Removal dated June 9, 2017, is timely. Removal is also sought within one year after commencement of the Action, so the timeliness requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(c) is likewise met.

III. LIST OF ATTACHED PROCESS, PLEADINGS AND ORDERS

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) and L.R. Civ 3.6, Humana attaches to this notice true and complete copies of all pleadings and other documents filed in the state court proceeding and served upon them in the Action. *See* Exhibit C.

IV. SERVICE OF NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), and contemporaneous with the filing of the instant Notice of Removal, Humana is filing a Notice of Removal to Federal Court with the Yavapai County Superior Court regarding the filing of this Notice of Removal, and

Case 3:17-cv-08107-DGC Document 1 Filed 06/09/17 Page 5 of 5 which satisfies the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d). 1 DATED this 9th day of June, 2017. 2 3 SPENCER FANE LLP 4 5 By s/Andrew M. Federhar Andrew M. Federhar 6 Jessica A. Gale Attorneys for Defendants Humana 7 Insurance Company and Humana Health Plan, Inc. 8 9 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 10 I hereby certify that on this 9th day of June, 2017, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF System for filing and 11 transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants: 12 David W. Williams 13 DAVIS MILES McGUIRE GARDNER 40 E. Rio Salado Parkway, Suite 425 14 Tempe, AZ 85281 efile.dockets@davismiles.com 15 Attorney for Plaintiff 16 17 s/ Katrina Thomas 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26